

### **REMARKS**

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. Prior to entry of this response, Claims 1-20 were pending in the application, of which Claims 1, 6, and 12 are independent. In the Final Office Action dated March 4, 2009, Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and Claim 6 was objected to. Following this response, Claims 1-20 remain in this application. Applicants hereby address the Examiner's rejections in turn.

#### **I. Interview Summary**

Applicants thank Examiner Godbold for the courtesy of a telephone interview on May 11, 2009, requested by the undersigned to discuss the rejection of the current claims under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103. During the interview, Applicants asserted that the cited references do not render obvious or anticipate the claims as currently amended. In agreement, the Examiner stated that the claims may overcome the cited references, but that an updated search would be necessary. No patentability agreement was reached.

#### **II. Information Disclosure Statements**

The undersigned requests the Examiner to return copies of the 1449 Forms filed with the Twenty-Sixth Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement filed April 8, 2008, Thirty-Fourth Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement filed March 30, 2009, and Thirty-Fifth Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement filed May 9, 2009, marked as being considered and initialed by the Examiner, with the next official communication.

### III. Objection to the Claims

In the Final Office Action dated March 4, 2009, the Examiner objected to Claim 6 as containing an informality. Claim 6 has been amended to address this informality and does not narrow the claimed subject matter. Applicants respectfully submit that the amendment overcomes this objection and adds no new matter.

### IV. Rejection of the Claims Under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(b) and 103(a)

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 6-14 and 18-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,415,304 (“*Horvitz*”). In addition, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-5 and 15-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Horvitz* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,415,304 (“*Satyanarayanan*”). Claims 1, 6, and 12 have been amended, and Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments overcome this rejection and add no new matter.

Amended Claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the reason that it recites, for example, “wherein passing to the recognizer application the pointer to the object model of the host application from which the text string is received enables the recognizer application to, via the pointer to the object model of the host application: utilize functionality of the host application to automatically perform the desired action associated with the recognized text string, and perform a subsequent recognition of a subsequent text string.” Amended Claims 6 and 12 each include a

similar recitation. Support for these amendments can be found in the specification at least on page 9, lines 16-22.

As stated by the Examiner, *Horvitz* does not disclose passing, to a recognizer application, a pointer to a host application object model. (See Office Action page 10, lines 11-12.) Consequently, *Horvitz* cannot disclose utilizing an object model pointer to call host application functionality because, as stated by the Examiner, *Horvitz* fails to disclose object model pointers.

Furthermore, *Satyanarayanan* does not overcome *Horvitz*'s deficiencies. For example, *Satyanarayanan* merely discloses that an object instance memory allocation module allocates memory blocks in an object oriented software system. (See col. 2, lines 49-50.) When an object instance in *Satyanarayanan* is instantiated from an object class, the object instance memory allocation module allocates, from an object instance pool entry, a memory block if available. (See col.2, lines, 55-58.) Nowhere does *Satyanarayanan* disclose utilizing host application functionality via a pointer to a host application object model, much less utilizing the pointer to perform subsequent string recognition. Rather, *Satyanarayanan* merely discloses memory functionality associated with an instantiated object.

Either individually or in any reasonable combination, *Horvitz* and *Satyanarayanan* would not have anticipated or led to the claimed subject matter because *Horvitz* and *Satyanarayanan* at least do not disclose "wherein passing to the recognizer application the pointer to the object model of the host application from which the text string is received enables the recognizer application to, via the pointer to the object model of the host application: utilize functionality of the host application to automatically perform the

desired action associated with the recognized text string, and perform a subsequent recognition of a subsequent text string,” as recited by amended Claim 1. Amended Claims 6 and 12 each include a similar recitation. Accordingly, independent Claims 1, 6, and 12 each patentably distinguish the present invention over the cited art, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of Claims 1, 6, and 12.

Dependent Claims 2-5, 7-11, and 13-20 are also allowable at least for the reasons described above regarding independent Claims 1, 6, and 12, and by virtue of their respective dependencies upon independent Claims 1, 6, and 12. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of dependent Claims 2-5, 7-11, and 13-20.

#### V. Conclusion

Applicants respectfully request that this Amendment After Final be entered by the Examiner, placing the claims in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully submit that the proposed amendments of the claims do not raise new issues or necessitate the undertaking of any additional search of the art by the Examiner, since all of the elements and their relationships claimed were either earlier claimed or inherent in the claims as examined. Therefore, this Amendment should allow for immediate action by the Examiner.

Finally, Applicants respectfully submit that the entry of the Amendment would place the application in better form for appeal, should the Examiner dispute the patentability of the pending claims.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims, as amended, are patentable over the cited references. The preceding arguments are based only on the arguments in the Final Official Action, and therefore do not address patentable aspects of the invention that were not addressed by the Examiner in the Final Official Action. The claims may include other elements that are not shown, taught, or suggested by the cited art. Accordingly, the preceding argument in favor of patentability is advanced without prejudice to other bases of patentability. Furthermore, the Final Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Final Office Action.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 13-2725.

Respectfully submitted,  
MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.

P.O. Box 2903  
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903  
404.954.5066

/D. Kent Stier/

Date: June 4, 2009

\_\_\_\_\_  
D. Kent Stier  
Reg. No. 50,640

DKS:mdc

